



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

506

87

1636

1



600007435P

34.

506.

AN
APOLOGY
FOR
CHURCH MUSIC
AND
Musical Festivals,

IN ANSWER TO THE ANIMADVERSIONS OF
THE STANDARD AND THE RECORD.

BY
EDWARD HODGES, M^{RS}. DOCT.
OF HENRY HUNTER COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; AND ORGANIST OF THE CHURCHES OF ST. JAMES
AND ST. NICHOLAS, BRISTOL.

"And let the roving organs loudly play
The praises of the Lord in lively notes;
The whistles, with hollow throates,
The choristers the joyous anthems sing.
That all the woods may answer, and their echoing ring."
SPENCER.

LONDON:
HIVINGTONS, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD
CHILCOTT, PRINTER, BRISTOL.

MDCCCXXXIV.



AN APOLOGY
FOR
CHURCH MUSIC, &c.

THERE is no science, human or divine, of such universal acception among mankind, as that no man can be found to impugn its pretensions. In this age of subversion, therefore, wherein all religion is denounced as priestcraft, and civil government as tyranny, we are not to wonder that music also should have its adversaries. And yet, if, in the whole range of human contemplation, there be any one thing which would seem less likely than all others to stir up strife and contention, that subject is the science of sweet sounds. Man, in all ages, from the infancy of the world to the present day, has recognised its power, and bowed to its influence. In every clime, from the frigid regions about the poles, to the burning plains of the torrid zone, music has been appealed to as the *laborum dulce lenimen*, the joy of buoyant youth, the solace of declining age. Practised by saints and angels, lauded by sage philosophers, encouraged by grave legislators, and sanctioned not only by the usage of time but by almost an identification with the most solemn offices of our most holy religion, it has come down to us to be aspersed and vilified in this our day as a pursuit utterly unworthy of an intellec-

tual being, and in its noblest exhibitions to be stigmatized as a profanation of our ecclesiastical edifices.

Now although nothing has been recently alleged against church music which has not been adduced and triumphantly refuted, again and again, in past times; yet forasmuch as it is possible that some persons may be carried away by the specious plausibility with which old sophistries have been tricked out, I have thought it not amiss, in the absence of a better champion, to attempt a brief reply to what modern gainsayers continue so pertinaciously to advance. This is the more necessary inasmuch as the opposition at present is principally conducted by two most respectable public prints, viz. the *STANDARD*, which may be considered as the organ of the high-church section of Toryism, and the *RECORD*, which may with equal truth be deemed the representative of the opinions of the so-called Evangelical party in the establishment. Had the "railing accusation" been confined to that portion of the public press which trades in sedition and revels in the imaginary perspective of the progressive destruction of all our venerable institutions, civil as well as sacred, the reproach might have been borne with honour, and suffered to pass unheeded as the idle snail which leaves its slimy track upon the village steeple. Every Christian musician (and I trust there are many such) feels on the occasion with David, the man after God's own heart, and yet the most musical king the world ever saw, when he bemoans himself in Psalm LV, "For it was not an enemy that reproached me, then I could have borne it; neither

was it he that hated me, that did magnify himself against me, then I would have hid myself from him :” a psalm appropriately addressed “To the chief musician on Neginoth.” Still I should not have had recourse to this method of defending the science which I have the honour to profess, had not the editor of the STANDARD refused to insert a short communication which I addressed to him in reply to some of his animadversions; contenting himself in his notice to correspondents with calling me “an enthusiast,” and informing the public that “he could not accommodate his conscience to be the means of disseminating *opinions* which he believed to be erroneous,”¹ although the letter referred to consisted principally of a statement of *facts*. Although this conduct of the editor would seem to be a departure from that straightforward rule of rectitude which I would fain believe has been and is generally his actuating principle, I cannot be very angry with him on the occasion, as it has afforded me an opportunity of throwing into a more permanent shape the few arguments which I hope shortly to bring forward.

The STANDARD from time to time, for many months last past, has dropt hints of its antipathy to music. At length it began to speak more distinctly, and under date of the 26th March has a passage of this sort :

“Sensuality of every kind, feasts and festivals, whether culinary or musical, *for both are alike sensual*, ought to be for ever excluded from the seats of learning and religion.”

¹ As this quotation is made by memory it is not likely to be verbally correct, but I believe that the sense is accurately preserved.

But its grand attack was perpetrated on occasion of its laudation of the conduct of the Bishop of London, in refusing to patronize the proposed festival in Westminster Abbey. Accordingly, in the paper bearing date March 31, we find such sentences as the following:

"If the Bishop thinks with us, that the propriety of employing a Church as a place of *sensual recreation*, or as a place for the collection of money, received in *consideration of enjoyment of any kind*; if the Bishop thinks with us that the propriety of such an employment of a Church is at best doubtful, it is surely not merely his right, but his duty to avoid taking part in the approaching festival."

"Our views are altogether practical. Laying out of view, for the present, the higher question, whether the application to *secular uses* of things usually devoted to the uses of religion be directly sinful or otherwise, we are quite sure that it is, consequentially, injurious to the interests of the Church that permits it."

"It is almost an instinct, or if it be not an instinct, it must be amongst the earliest truths that open to the mind, which teaches that the things of this world cannot be permitted to intrude upon the consideration of the next, and the services which these last enjoin, without detriment to the purity of religious feeling. Nor must we lose sight of the fact, that at present the Church of England is, in the strictest sense of the word a Church militant; that she is beset with enemies, by no means scrupulous in their warfare—with enemies who could easily enough convert *a muster of singers and fiddlers* in one of her principal temples, with an apparatus of check-takers and door-keepers to *collect money for hearing these singers and fiddlers*, into a very opprobrious similitude of a theatrical representation; and, unquestionably, they who would so represent a musical festival in a cathedral, would find ready hearers amongst the *non-musical part of the world, that is, among nineteen-twentieths of the population*, including ourselves in the unhappy majority. It is very true, there are those who think that music may be made subservient to the cultivation of religion; but it is a doleful truth that there are also those, we are persuaded *the great majority*, if they dare confess it, *who feel even the very small infusion of music usually permitted in our liturgical service, an obstruction, rather than an aid to their religious contemplations*. The truth of the matter is, the musical faculty is not indigenous to our soil.² We must not fall into the common mistake, that a love of songs is a taste for music, even were

² The editor, perhaps, had forgotten that England has acquired among foreigners the musical appellative of "The Ringing island."

we a *singing people, which we are not*. It is merely the gratification which arises from the combination of variety with regularity, as expressed in sounds, the same which we see exhibited in dancing, which adds to whatever pleasure is afforded by the words of a song,—but we must not get into a metaphysical treatise. Suffice it to say, that as the uninitiated in music do not go to musical festivals for the sake of devotion, so it may reasonably be doubted, that *many* who do go to such festivals may be classed with those who go to church

‘To hear the music there;’

and that *many more* deceive themselves into the notion that their feelings are religious, when they are little better than animal sensations.”

Here follows a long quotation from the “Life of Mary Jane Graham,” which is very excellent but not to the point, seeing that it is an eulogy upon sacred music, rather than a deprecation of it, and concludes with a touching exhortation to those who are affected by it not to mistake the feelings excited *by music only*, for the influence of genuine religious sentiments: after which the article proceeds,

“And now one word to church music generally—a word which we think it the more imperative to offer, because we have observed a *strong disposition amongst some of the best ministers of the Church, to increase its quantity* by chaunting, to the organ, the ‘*Te Deum*,’ the ‘*Jubilate*,’ the ‘*Nunc dimittas*,’ [dimittis] and other portions of the church service, so eloquent, so full of masculine dignity in their composition, that *music, or any other added ornament, cannot fail to deform them*. The word that we would say, we shall put into the form of a question. Has church music proved favourable to devotion amongst the humbler classes? Has the addition of an organ increased the congregation of country churches? Nay, has it not had the reverse effect? Has it not deprived the people frequently of the interest which they took in what we may intelligibly, though not properly call as a distinction, the vocal part of the church service? Our own experience certainly concludes unfavourably to the use of instrumental music in Divine worship; and for a reason which we have hinted above, we wish to see all the musical part of the service within the old limits, which were sufficient to give rest to the clergyman.”

"To return to the Westminster festival. Might it not be as well held in Westminster Hall as in Westminster Abbey, *where all occasion of offence would be removed?* The purpose of the celebration is good; *the celebration itself blameless: the only objection is to the place—why not change the place?* Why set an example of treating lightly the reverence due to sacred things? One more last word. We know to what irritable race musical people belong; and therefore we declare that we shall not defend in controversy any of the opinions which we have advanced above. Our *fair* readers, of all ages, and *sexes*, and professions, may call us Goths, with a perfect assurance that they will not be answered."

However, notwithstanding the "assurance" with which the foregoing paragraph terminates, the editor was induced to bestow yet more last words upon the subject in his paper of April 2. This effect was elicited by the remonstrances of a correspondent who signs himself "an Humble Churchman," who had adduced several pertinent quotations from the works of the Rev. W. Jones, of Nayland, one of which only shall be here introduced.

"Music will need no other recommendation to our attention, as an important subject, when it shall be understood, as I mean to show in the first place, that it derives its origin from God himself; whence it will follow, that so far as it is God's work it is His property, and may certainly be applied as such to His service. The question will be, whether it may be applied to any thing else."

The signal excellence of this pious sentiment will, I am sure, be a sufficient justification of its insertion in this place, notwithstanding it does in a manner anticipate the orderly course of the subject. The editor of the STANDARD comments upon the letter thus:

"The great respect in which we hold the opinions of our correspondent, '*An Humble Churchman*,' causes us to deviate, though very reluctantly, from the resolution which we avowed at the time, not to defend in controversy our opinions upon the subject of church music. Upon a careful perusal of our correspondent's letter, however, we

discover, as we think, that our dispute may be brought within a very narrow compass. Is the enjoyment derived from music, sensual or intellectual? If it be *sensual* merely, then *all* the extraordinary effects ascribed to music are, plainly, objections to its admission as part of an *intellectual service*. Now, we agree with our correspondent that the reception of musical sounds, through the agency of the senses, is not, alone, conclusive—that the pleasure derived from those sounds is purely sensual; but when we find that *the pleasure is just as great where the sounds do not and cannot, in any way, convey any definite idea to the understanding*, we must conclude that *with the senses it begins and ends*—in other words, that *it is purely sensual*; and that such it is, appears plainly enough to us from the fact, that *it acts as powerfully upon irrational animals as upon rational*; and that those of our own species, who delight in music, are *as much affected by it when it is accompanied by the words of an unknown language, or unaccompanied by any words whatever*. This appears to us as decisive against the intellectual character of music. The question then is, as to the convenience of an alloy of what is not intellectual, infused into ‘the singing of the heart and of the understanding.’ Some are excited by music; some are excited by dancing; some are excited by opium, and by less innocent means of intoxication. Under excitement produced by any of these means, their devotions may appear to themselves more sincere, and to others more fervent; but the heart of man, ‘deceitful above all things,’ never deceives itself more completely, or perhaps more fatally, than when it mistakes the fever of excitement for the steady glow of piety.”

“As to our correspondent’s reference to the Jewish ritual, we would remind him that other means of excitement than music were permitted in that ritual; wisely permitted according to the purpose of the Jewish dispensation, and to the state of the peculiar people to whom that dispensation was given: according, we may add, to the state of the surrounding world. The Gospel, however, without changing the object of man’s adoration, or the moral purpose of man’s improvement, introduced a system of worship not more strongly contrasted in the glorious comprehensiveness of its objects, than in the severe simplicity of its forms. It is the Gospel of the poor, as well as of the rich—of the rude, as well as of the refined; as such it was dispensed by its Divine Author; as such it ought to be dispensed by his servants. There is not one word in the noble liturgy of our own Church, which is not as plain to the comprehension of the most ignorant as of the most learned; not one word, which gravely addressed to the general understanding, may not, under the grace of Divine Providence, reach the understanding and the heart too, of the humblest worshipper. What needs there then the aid of music? We had almost said, what justification is there for exposing men to the danger of mistaking animal sensation for a masculine devout conviction? Our own experience certainly has been, *that the introduction of instrumental music is the reverse of beneficial, more*

particularly in country churches; otherwise we should not have alluded to a subject so much out of the province of a daily newspaper. But we think, we must repeat it, that *the church organ has done much to fill Dissenting chapels*, and to *repel the humbler classes of our fellow-subjects to much worse places* than Dissenting chapels. We have no wish to see our Cathedrals closed, or to have their choirs silenced. Let those who delight in music, and are satisfied that music aids their devotions, repair to those Cathedrals; they are generally of the higher and middle classes, and therefore will feel little inconvenience. But let us, the poor, unlearned, rude, and humble, still have the severe simplicity of our parochial service."

"Our correspondent will observe that our objections are all strictly practical; and he, at least, will not charge us with any spirit of Puritanism. We can assure him that as far as respects the effect of church music upon the class to which we ourselves belong, we have merely stated the result of very general, not local, observation, continued through a great number of years."

"This allusion to the subject must be final, on our part; but we anxiously hope that it may be taken up by others better qualified than we are, and who can command a field of discussion more worthy of the subject."

Nevertheless this allusion was *not* final, for a few days afterwards appeared some further remarks upon the subject, wherein the Editor shewed some tendency to shift his ground, and fell back upon one of Queen Elizabeth's injunctions to her clergy, (of which more hereafter,) as his army of reserve. Again he was induced to touch upon the matter in consequence of what fell from the Duke of Newcastle in the House of Lords; on which occasion the Editor reiterated his recommendation to hold the festival in some other *place* than Westminster Abbey.

Such are the objections of the STANDARD.

The RECORD bases its opposition to Musical Festivals upon rather different grounds. Under date of April 24, it speaks thus:

"We are not surprised that any conscientious man, whatever may be his religious sentiments, should, on reflection, feel a repugnance to such exhibitions as those, in which the sacred mysteries of reve-

lation are degraded to the level of opera songs ; and the solemn temples of Christian worship are converted into *places of theatrical entertainment*, and let out to a multitude of votaries of pleasure."

"There were many things connected with the commemoration of Handel, and performance of the Messiah, calculated to dazzle and mislead a less enthusiastic votary of music than the monarch, [George III.] who so long ruled in the hearts of his loyal subjects. But in the lapse of fifty years, the true character of these festivals has been more evidently manifested ; and the 'revelling and banquetting' with which they are associated, the masquerading, the dancing, the dissipation which constitute so prominent a part of 'the entertainment,' proclaim in language too plain to be mistaken, that these festivals are not of God, but 'of the world, and therefore the world hears them.'"

An argument on the other side of the question having been drawn from the solemnities of the Coronation, the editor comments on it as follows :

"—— As nothing but what is sacred and solemn is admitted into the ceremonial of the Abbey, the parallel between the Coronation and the Musical Festivals altogether fails."—

"And is such a solemnity as this, [the Coronation] to be put on a footing with a Musical Festival ; with an exhibition intended to *gratify the senses*, in which the sublime language of Scripture is *desecrated to purposes of pleasure* ; to reward those for whose amusement the performers at the Opera house, or the concert have been hired, to utter the high praises of 'Jehovah'?"

And now, having given the objections of the adversaries in their full force, I will proceed to reply to them ; first, however, quoting a sentence or two from an old author whom I may have occasion to cite more at large by and by, and this I do because it will serve to show, that there were music-revilers in England at least as far back as the sixteenth century.

Now although there be none but few men so senselesse and blockish by nature, or of disposition so peevish and waitward, that taking no delight in Musick themselves, and measuring the worth and price thereof, by their own affections, do account of it as a thing either vain and unlawful, or idle and unprofitable ; yet there be many, who albeit they allow a moderate and sober vse of

it in ciuill mattets, do notwithstanding cast it out of the church as an vncleane thing, and will bouchsafe it no place in the seruice of God. But if the vse thereof be proued to be not lawfull only in the church, but profitable also and decent, by the practise of the church at all times, the opinion of the best learned in all ages, and the authority of the Scriptures themselves in many places; I trust that these men will reforme their opinions from thinking so basely of it, or reſtaine their toungeſ from inueighing ſo bitterly againſt it.³

These words, although written a quarter of a millenium ago, are as applicable to parties now as they were then. Methinks, these unfortunate individuals (for, did they think with Dr. Johnson, they would esteem the absence of the participation of musical pleasures as a privation to be deplored, rather than to be vaunted,) must be of the number of those of whom old Hooker speaks. "They must have hearts very dry and tough, from whom the *melody* of the Psalms doth not sometimes draw that wherein a mind religiously affected delighteth."

The arguments of the editor of the *STANDARD*, against church music in general, may be summed up thus: that the pleasure derived from music is "*purely sensual*," and on a level with the excitement produced by opium or by dram-drinking,—that it necessarily "*deforms*" the sacred words with which it is associated,—that the people of England, especially the "humbler classes," are not a musical people,—and that the "great majority" of them feel even a "small infusion of music" to be "an obstruction rather than an aid to their religious contemplations,"—that with the ex-

³ *The Praise of Musicke*, Oxford, 1586.

ception of "plain song" our Church does not approve its use,—and that therefore, although he would allow it in Cathedrals, it ought to be religiously banished from parochial churches, as being incompatible with what he terms an "intellectual service," and utterly inconsistent with the "severe simplicity" of the Gospel. Against instrumental music in particular, and especially the "church organ," he urges, that it deprives the people of the interest which they would otherwise take in the vocal part of the service,—and that it "has done much to fill Dissenting chapels, and to repel the humbler classes of our fellow subjects to much worse places than Dissenting chapels," by which I presume he means beer houses and gin shops.

Such of his exceptions against Musical Festivals in churches as are not included in the foregoing, are : that they are *secular* in their character,—and that the many thousands who annually flock to attend them, repair thither for "sensual recreation" only, and contribute large sums of money "*in consideration of the enjoyment*" thence derived to them.

Be it noted that I am not answerable for any degree of inconsistency which may be apparent upon the face of this grievous charge ; I have not wilfully misstated any of the arguments of the adversary, and as I have before given his own words, the reader is in a condition to judge for himself. Now for the reply.

Surely then the leading dogma, that musical pleasure is purely *sensual*—a dogma upon which the editor has reared his entire superstructure of de-

clamation—is but a monstrous abuse of words. That it is derived through the medium of one of the senses, no one will take upon him to deny: but is it *therefore* sensual? Then reading a newspaper or even the bible itself, conversing with a friend or listening with devout pleasure to the eloquence of a preacher of the Gospel, may all likewise be classed as *sensual* recreations. But the opponent, in his second grand attack, guards this point by affirming and attempting to prove, that the pleasure derived from music “with the senses *begins* and *ends*,” a proposition which he endeavours to support by alleging that it acts *as powerfully* upon irrational animals as upon mankind, and that all musical men are *as much affected by it* when purely instrumental as when conjoined with devotional words; allegations which if true would not assist the demonstration of his previous proposition, but the truth of which I roundly deny, and dare him to the proof. For is not a faithful dog as powerfully affected by a few words from his master, as any rational creature could be under the like circumstances; and is this to be drawn into proof that the pleasure derived through the communication of spoken language is universally *sensual*? And as to his allegation concerning music merely instrumental, it carries with it its own refutation, unless he will take upon him to affirm that there is *no power at all* in language; for if there be any, that power must be *superadded* to the effect of the music when they enter into combination. But what if it should be found that instrumental music possesses the power not only of pleasing

the ear, but through the ear of exciting the imagination, by calling up certain trains of ideas; whether by the aid of that powerful auxiliary—association, or by means of other resources of the art: would this amount to a proof that musical pleasure “begins and ends with the senses?” I trow not.

Perhaps, however, our Editor will concede to authority, what he would not be disposed to yield to my weak argumentation. I will debar myself from citing the testimony of musicians, because they may be considered as interested witnesses. And first, Sir John Hawkins.

“The powers of the imagination, with great appearance of reason, are said to hold a middle place between the organs of bodily sense, and the faculties of moral perception; the subjects on which they are severally exercised, are common to the *senses of seeing and hearing*, the office of which is *simply perception*; *all pleasure thence arising being referred to the imagination*. The arts which administer to the imaginative faculty the greatest delight, are confessedly, poetry, painting, and music.”

Perhaps, however, Sir John may be excepted against as a suspicious witness, inasmuch as he may be pronounced guilty of having written a History of Music. We will pass on. “Music,” says Dryden, “is inarticulate poetry.” What! poetry sensual too? then are the psalms of David sensual compositions!

But as a poet is next of kin to a musician, I suppose we must not have recourse to more of the class, else might we call upon our mighty Shakespeare to pass sentence on “the man that hath not music *in his soul*.” Let us hear a philosopher. The great Lord Bacon, in his “*Sylva Sylvarum*,” hath these words:

"The Causes of that which is *Pleasing*, or *Ingrate* to the *Hearing*, may receive light by that which is *Pleasing*, or *Ingrate* to the *Sight*. There bee two Things Pleasing to the Sight (leaving *Pictures* and *Shapes* aside, which are but Secondary Objects, and please or displease but in Memory;) these two are, *Colours* and *Order*. The pleasing of Colour symbolizeth with the *Pleasing* of any *Single Tone* to the *Eare*; but the Pleasing of *Order* doth symbolize with *Harmony*. And therefore we see in *Garden-knots*, and the *Frets of Houses*, and all equall and well answering *Figures*, (as *Globes*, *Pyramides*, *Cones*, *Cylinders*, &c.) how they please; whereas *unequal Figures* are but deformities. And both these *Pleasures*, that of the *Eye*, and that of the *Eare*, are but the Effects of *Equality*, *Good Proportion*, or *Correspondence*: So that (out of *Question*) *Equality*, and *Correspondence*, are the *Causes of Harmony*."—p. 37.

Is this sensuality? But hear his Lordship further.

"It hath beene anciently held, and observed, that the *Sense of Hearing*, and the *Kinds of Musick*, have most Operation upon *Manners*."—"And therefore we see, that *Tunes* and *Aires*, even in their own Nature, have in themselves some Affinity with the *Affections*; As there bee *Merry Tunes*, *Dolefull Tunes*, *Solemne Tunes*, *Tunes inclining Men's mindes to Pity*, *Warlike Tunes*, &c. So as it is no Marvell, if they alter the *Spirits*; considering that *Tunes* have a Predisposition to the *Motion* of the *Spirits* in themselves. But yet it hath been noted, that though this variety of *Tunes* doth dispose the *Spirits* to variety of Passions, conforme unto them; yet generally *Musick* feedeth that disposition of the *Spirits* which it findeth."—p. 38.

But this may be set down as antiquated philosophy: and I must not have recourse to the Greeks; for their enthusiastic panegyrics upon music would certainly be deemed the effect of mere superstitious fables. Some of these, as also many commendations on the part of the school-men and others, more especially as to its medicinal effect, may be seen enumerated by Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, part 2, sect. 2, memb. 6, subsect. 3, which I omit. The next author called into court shall be one of more recent date. Mr. Harris, in one of his much-celebrated "*Three Treatises*," speaks of Music as "*a most powerful Ally*" of Poetry. He adds,

"It is to be observed, that there are various *Affections*, which may be raised by the Power of *Music*. There are Sounds to make us *cheerful* or *sad*, *martial* or *tender*; and so of almost every other Affection which we feel. It is also further observable, that there is a *reciprocal Operation* between our *Affections* and our *Ideas*."

Again, after some further preliminary remarks,

"Now this being premised, it will follow, that whatever happens to be the *Affection* or *Disposition* of Mind, which ought naturally to result from the Genius of any *Poem*, the *same* probably it will be in the Power of some Species of *Music* to excite. But whenever the *proper Affection* prevails, it has been allowed that then *all kindred Ideas*, derived from external Causes, make the *most sensible Impression*. The Ideas therefore of Poetry must needs make the most sensible Impression, when the Affections, peculiar to them, are already excited by the Music. For here a *double Force* is made *co-operate to one End*. A Poet, *thus assisted*, finds not an Audience in a Temper, averse to the Genius of his Poem, or perhaps at best under a cool *Indifference*; but by the Preludes, the Symphonies, and *concurrent Operation* of the Music in all its Parts, roused into *those very Affections*, which he would most desire."—p. 98.

And thereupon he adduces Quintilian to the same effect. I might insert the entire Treatise, but must content myself with two very short extracts more. He declares, at p. 99, that

"There are few to be found so insensible, I may even say so inhumane, as when GOOD POETRY IS JUSTLY SET TO MUSIC, not in some degree to feel the Force of so *amiable an Union*;"

and shortly afterwards, in reply to the possible objection arising from the alleged *unnaturalness* of the musical enunciation of the words, he says of the poet,

"He cannot surely but confess, that he is a *Gainer in the Exchange*, when he *barters* the want of a single Probability, that of *Pronunciation*, for a *noble Heightening of the Affections* which are suitable to the Occasion, and enable him to enter into the Subject with double *Energy* and *Enjoyment*."—p. 101.

Is such an ally as this, I ask, to be restricted to secular uses? Ought it not rather to be sedulously consecrated to the service of Him from whom it

originated? But the STANDARD says it is *sensual*; and, doubtless, on some matters of intelligence, the STANDARD is a great authority. But for the present to leave secular authority, and come to that of the divines of our own church, I will first cite a passage from the incomparable Hooker.

"Touching Musical Harmony whether by Instrument or by Voice, such is the force thereof, and so pleasing effects it hath *in that very part of Man which is most Divine*, that some have been thereby induced to think that the Soul itself by Nature is, or hath in it, Harmony. A thing which delighteth all Ages, and beseebeth all States; a thing as seasonable in grief as in joy; as decent being added unto actions of greatest weight and solemnity, as being used when Men most sequester themselves from action."

"In Harmony the very Image and Character even of Virtue and Vice is perceived, the mind delighted with their Resemblances, and brought by having them often iterated into a love of the things themselves. For which cause there is nothing more contagious and pestilent than some kinds of Harmony; than some, *nothing more strong and potent unto good*."

"There is that draweth to a marvellous grave and sober mediocrity; there is also that carrieth as it were into ecstasies, filling the mind with an heavenly joy, and for the time in a manner, severing it from the body: So that although we lay altogether aside the consideration of Ditty or Matter, the very Harmony of Sounds being framed in due sort, and carried from the Ear to the Spiritual faculties of our Souls, is by a Native Puissance and Efficacy greatly available to bring into a perfect temper whatsoever is there troubled; apt as well to quicken the spirits, as to allay that which is too eager; sovereign against melancholy and despair; forceable to draw forth tears of devotion, if the mind be such as can yield them; able both to move and to moderate all affections. The Prophet *David* having therefore singular knowledge, not in Poetry alone, but in Musick also, judged them both to be things *most necessary for the House of God*, left behind him to that purpose a number of divinely indited poems; and was further the Author of adding unto Poetry melody in publick Prayer; melody both Vocal and Instrumental, for the raising up of Men's hearts, and the sweetening of their affections towards God. *In which considerations, the Church of Christ doth likewise at this present day, retain it as an ornament to God's service, and an help to our devotion*. They which under pretence of the Law Ceremonial abrogated, require the abrogation of Instrumental Musick, approving nevertheless the use of Vocal Melody to remain, must shew some reason wherefore the one should be thought a Legal Ceremony and not the other. In Church Musick, curiosity and os-

tentation of Art, wanton, or light, or unsuitable Harmony, such as only pleaseth the ear, and doth not naturally serve to the very kind and degree of those impressions, which the matter that goeth with it leaveth, or is apt to leave, in Men's minds, doth rather blemish and disgrace that we do, than add either beauty or furtherance unto it. On the other side, the faults prevented, the force and efficacy of the thing when it drowneth not utterly, but fitly suited with matter altogether sounding to the praise of God, *is in truth most admirable, and doth much edifie*, if not the understanding, because it teacheth not; yet surely the affection, because therein it worketh much."—ECCLES. POL., Lib. V. p. 238.

It would be long indeed, to quote the sentiments upon this subject of the innumerable ornaments of the English Church; but I will crave permission to introduce one or two more. Dr. Gauden, Bishop of Exon, towards the close of the seventeenth century, in his "Considerations touching the Liturgy of the Church of England," p. 35, speaks thus,

"Some have been more at discord with the Liturgy, because they find in cathedrals, and other great churches, the use of *Musick both Vocal and Organical*, have been applied to some parts of it; which certainly is as Lawful as any *Meeter, Psalmody, Hymnology, or singing to Tunes*; which was never questioned by learned and godly Men for lawful in the Worship of God, publick or private, especially that of Praising and giving Thanks: Nay, there is no scruple but that even in Prayer, and the deepest notes of that, viz. Penitentials, both Musick of Voice and Instruments may be so gravely and soberly applied, as may very much fit the temper of Men's Spirits, and the Spirits of that Duty; when either sad and solemn with Grief, or chearful and exalted with Joy: Who doubts but *David* and the whole Church of the Jews served God *in Spirit and in Truth*, amidst those joyful and harmonious Noises, they used with Singers and Musical Instruments? The Gift and Use of Musick is so sweet, so Angelical, so Heavenly and Divine, that it is pity God should not have the Glory and Honour of it in his Service, and the Church an holy Comfortable use of it: Certainly the Christian Church hath more cause to rejoice than the Jews had; and we see the Angels at Christ's Nativity began the Church Musick with the heavenly quire."

He subsequently says, that

"It was only fit for those Men's rudeness to abandon Church Musick, who intended to fill all things with the Alarms of War and Cries of Confusion."—[quoted from Newte's Preface to Dodwell.]

—expressions which, no doubt, had been amply verified in his own experience. But passing over Hammond, Stillingfleet, Wetenhall, and other worthies of the church, we will come at once to more modern divines, of whom (and I speak it not disrespectfully) the choice is so great, that I know not where to pitch. I will, however, select some sentences. And first from Dr. Bisse, Chancellor of the Cathedral of Hereford, who in a sermon preached at Hereford, at the anniversary meeting of the three choirs, Gloucester, Worcester, and Hereford, in the year 1726, and inscribed to Dr. Croft, thus addresses his congregation :

“ Though I am far from affirming, that the Soul is or was made for harmony ; yet I cannot affirm less, than that harmony was ordained for man, yea, for the chief among the delights ordained for the sons of men.”—p. 22.

“ The strange objections against the use of musick in churches, invented in these latter times, could in the Primitive have no possible plea or pretence, either from *Jew* or *Gentile*.”—p. 24.

“ No ; the continuation of musick in the Christian church, was, and must ever be, rather an invitation to *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and all unbelievers, to come into its communion ; the inclination of nature, and the love of usage, that second nature, concurring in them to verify that prophecy, that in that day *they should come to Sion with singing, and joy should be upon their head*.”—[“ Musick the Delight of the Sons of Men,” Innys, London, 1726.]

And again, speaking of those who have a disrelish for sacred music, he calls them

“ Unhappy auditors, who *refuse to hear the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely*. Let not such be auditors ; let them wisely keep off from the sound of the doctrine and musick of the holy place. Such only as *have ears to hear, let them hear*.”—p. 28.

From Newton’s sermon, on a similar occasion at Gloucester, in the year 1748, I shall make two or three short extracts.

"We can only say in general, that the Influences of Sounds, *musically disposed and combined*, are as admirable as the manner in which they are conveyed. Their surprizing Power either to *awaken* or *compose* the Mind,—and their absolute Empire over all the Passions in the Composition of Man, are universally felt and acknowledged; there is hardly any Constitution so gross and callous, as to be completely proof against them. How sweetly does the insinuating force of *Eloquence* and *Numbers* steal upon the Soul, even without the Concurrence of *Musick*! and how is that Force *accelerated* and *augmented*, when this *Sister Art* is called in to their Assistance."—p. 9.

"The *Scripture Instances* of the Application of Musick to compose the irregular Affections, to prepare the Mind for humane and spiritual Impressions, and to excite that holy Fervour which gives Life to Devotion, are so well known, and have been so often cited, that it is needless to repeat them."—p. 19.

After adverting to the musical service of the Jews, the preacher proceeds :

"And the same order was observed in the Temple in our Saviour's Days;—it was daily dignified by his immaculate Presence;—and, though with regard to the open and scandalous Abuses of those Times, *the Zeal of God's House had eaten him up*, he never expressed the least Dislike of the *Psaltery, Trumpet, and Cymbal*, or *drove the Players on all Kinds of Instruments out of the Temple*."—p. 21.

Next proceeding to show that "the Use of Musick in the Church is by no means inconsistent with the Spiritual Simplicity of the Christian Scheme," (which he does from the usage of our Saviour and of his apostles and the primitive churches) he adds :

"To strengthen, diversify, and heighten the Influence of her *vocal Harmony*, she now borrows the Assistance of Instruments;—this she has done for some Centuries;—in this Method of conducting our public Praise, we are joined by the Followers of *Luther*, and even of *Calvin*, who, in several Parts of Europe, have the general Use of *Instrumental Musick* in their established Churches."

"If long and almost *universal Use* then, can make any method of Worship *lawful*, this must be *lawful*;—nor is it less *expedient*."—p. 23.

"In a Word, with the Accession of the Instrument to the *Voice*, all Things are done *decently and in order*; the Defects of the

Unskilful are covered, the Performance of the improved Singer is rendered more irresistibly attractive.—p. 24.

“There are, indeed, some Persons so formed as to *be incapable* of receiving this Aid from *Musick* in their religious Performances;—whose Dislike of our Method of Worship is manifestly owing to a Defect in Nature. These we should pity as Persons unhappily deprived of a most innocent and affecting Enjoyment.”—p. 25.

“And if any are, by the Dictates of a *vicious or prejudiced Mind*, determined to *judge us in this Matter, the Offence cometh from themselves*;—*we are not under Bondage* in such Cases, and we may, without *Breach of Charity*, pray that our Church may ever have the *free Use* of her *instructive Melody*,—that *he that hath Ears to hear* may hear,—that he may still *be joyful in the Lord, and come before his Presence with a Song.*”—p. 26.

In a sermon preached before “the Three Choirs,” on the 12th Sept. 1753, by the Rev. W. Parker, B. D. Rector of Little Illford in Essex, F. R. S. &c. we find similar sentiments, (indeed, they pervade the universal church.)

“Musick has in all ages been esteemed the strongest incentive of passion : and in all ages has it been so esteemed, because in all ages it has been so experienced. Where then can we employ it better, than to animate our love and thankfulness in celebrating the praises of the common father of the universe ?”

“The perception of harmony, so strongly and universally communicated through all ranks and nations of men, in different degrees of delicate sensibility, is a strong presumptive argument, that it was bestowed for other ends and higher purposes, than merely to divert and to amuse.”

“The ear is made one of the most grateful inlets of pleasure to the soul ; and the gratifications conveyed through this channel have the most powerful influence on the spiritual part of our composition.”—p. 14.

“Our church, thinking that she cannot follow a securer example in piety, than that of him who had this testimony, *that he found favour with God*, doth retain musick in her cathedral worship, which is her most publick form, as an ornament to divine service, and a natural help and incentive to man’s devotion. It is an aid, in short, as natural, as it hath been universal.”—p. 18.

I should never have done, were I to set myself to extract corresponding sentiments from the works of our English divines generally. I must, however,

quote one or two more. In a sermon preached at Salisbury, in the year 1726, by Thomas Naish, A. M. at that time Sub-Dean, music is thus spoken of:

"Were that Musick, which is attributed to the Saints in Bliss, all *Metaphor*; yet still this betokens that there is something in it that is very lovely, excellent, and divine, in that they are said to use it. The employment of their endless Life may worthily take up some Part of ours; and this is no mean Commendation of this Art, that of all the Sciences this alone is admitted to a Place in Heaven. *Whether there be Tongues they shall cease, and whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away*, but there shall be Musick for ever in the presence of God, and in the Society of his Saints."—p. 8.

"Having such a noble Pattern before us, 'tis but reasonable, that we should use the same Means to the like End, and we need not fear the spoiling the Spirituality of our Service with that which is the delightful exercise of the Saints in Bliss."—p. 11.

Although at the risk of being tedious, I cannot refrain from making yet another extract from the same sermon.

"But this Fervency of the Blessed above, is a severe Reproach to such as look upon this Art only as an innocent and harmless Thing, or as an Amusement only to delight us with a pleasing Entertainment. It would not have found place in Heaven, nor been practis'd there with such *Fervency*, had it not been of more real Worth, and serv'd to nobler Ends."

"And therefore, as to such dry insipid Souls, who can relish none of its Delights"—"as they are without *Knowledge*, so I wish they were not without *Charity*; but had so much at least as not to envy and reproach us, who are willing to taste *Angels' Food*."—p. 20.

To the same effect speaketh Mr. Newte, in his preface to Dodwell's "Treatise concerning the Lawfulness of Instrumental Musick in Holy Offices," printed 1700, an excellent disquisition, which I shall have occasion to cite presently.

"And why may it not be still an Ornament to God's Service, and an help to our Devotion, while it makes our Church an Emblem of the Heavenly Quire, which is represented as praising God after this manner: compare *Rev. xiv. 2, 3*, with *1 Chron. xvi. 5, 42*. It can-

not be presumed we should have read in Holy Writ of *Citharists* and *Harpers* in *Heaven*, if such *Instruments* of Musick were offensive to God on Earth; or say there is no Musick in *Heaven*: Yet as one well observes, there is a kind of *Heaven* in Musick, and such as raiseth the Soul to Angelical Exaltations."—Pref., p. 46.

I feel constrained to quote some of the glowing words of the Rev. W. L. Bowles, from his spirited letter to Lord Henley upon *Church Reform*, were it only to avail myself of the opportunity of thus publicly tendering my grateful acknowledgments to that dignitary for his disinterested friendship. What says he?

"But let me tell you, my Lord, if nothing were found more exceptionable in the Church of Rome than its music, there would have been little occasion for Luther's reformation."—p. 42.

The STANDARD doubtless says otherwise. But hear the poetical Canon of Salisbury again.

"But beautiful melodies and sublime harmonies, set to the literal words of the psalms—with such simplicity and truth of accent and expression—such thrilling 'concord of sweet sounds,' as to affect the inmost soul, and raise the thought above 'this pinfold here,' to the everlasting joys of heaven—are not *Popish*, but of the uncorrupted primitive Church."—p. 44.

"Who can listen to the strains of Tallis, Gibbons, Blow and his school, Purcell, Croft, Boyce, and Kent, without feeling the heart purified from earth, and lifted up to heaven?"—p. 45.

And subsequently he addresses Lord Henley, in the following forcible terms:

"Can all the *Puritans* who rail, or ever railed, against all the interesting and innocent auxiliaries to devotion, persuade you out of your own understanding and fair feelings? I beseech you again, my Lord, for the sake of that sole art associated with the purer enjoyments of heaven, turn your *ear* and *heart* from the 'suggestions' of such heartless counsellors."—[e.g. as the Editor of the Standard.]

In such hands may be safely left the defence of

our Cathedral musical services. I should but weaken the force of the words by adding to them. The Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval's letter to Lord Henley on the same subject, contains some equally warm expressions, a few of which, with the alteration of one word only, (which I will carefully mark by brackets) shall follow.

"The desolation cannot last for ever. When the whirlwind has swept by, and they who thought to ride upon it are blown into oblivion, then shall we again lift up our heads. Either we shall witness the restoration, and hear the voice of joy and gladness once more in our dwellings, see the waste places rebuilt, again hear the pealing organ swell its note of praise, and the merry bells ring out their jocund sound; or our pilgrimage will be over, and we shall have exchanged, through the Redeemer's blood, our earthly choirs for celestial. For your Lordship's sake, I trust that, ere that time arrives, a sounder judgement will possess you in these matters. Lest, haply, when the heavenly portals are flung open to receive you, and the sound of the celestial concert strikes your ear, 'the harpers harping with their harps;' the clang of the archangel's 'trumpet;' some clear voiced angel leading the hymns; the seraphim responding to each other with the trisagion; the four and twenty, and the four singing their new song of worthiness; and the full chorus of the one hundred and forty four thousand, pouring forth that song which none but they can learn; your heart be *chilled* within you, and you show the superior soundness and purity of your piety by turning away in disgust from such [*sensual*] abominations."—p. 31.

One more quotation on this topic, and then we will proceed to a somewhat different view of the subject. Bishop Horne, in his pious preface to the Commentary on the Psalms, (a commentary in which he frequently adverts to the value of religious music) says,

"They [the psalms] are adorned with the figures, and set off with all the graces of poetry; and poetry itself is designed yet farther to be recommended by the charms of music, thus consecrated to the service of God; that so delight may prepare the way for improvement, and pleasure become the handmaid of wisdom, while every

turbulent passion is calmed by sacred melody, and the evil Spirit is still dispossessed by the harp of the son of Jesse."⁴

Still, says the Editor of the *STANDARD*, music is *sensual*, and therefore ought not to be admitted into Christian worship. Well; let us close with him on that point. What does he mean by the word *sensual*? True, he disclaims the possible imputation of *Puritanism*; but methinks if the word *carnal* were substituted for *sensual*,—and I must honestly confess, that I see not wherein the words differ in signification,—the objection would well enough suit the character of *Praise-God-Barebones* himself. Giving the word then its utmost latitude, and understanding thereby "*bodily* exercise" merely, I will freely acknowledge, upon the highest possible authority, that it "*profiteth little*;" but I will *not* grant that therefore it profiteth *not at all*. Nay, I think I have good reason for stating, that it is as much the duty of a Christian man to present his *body* a living sacrifice, holy and *acceptable unto God*, which is also his *reasonable service*, as it is to worship God "in spirit and in

⁴ A literal realization of this assertion occurred a short time since, as narrated by Dr. Epps in the *Spectator*. A religious lady, the exemplary mother of a large family, and the faithful wife of an affectionate husband, had fallen into a state of hypochondriacal melancholy, in which she imagined herself to be so much under the influence of the Holy Ghost, that she would not suffer either her husband or her children to approach her; totally abstracted herself from the ordinary duties of life; and refused to make any oral communication to any person whatever; carefully maintaining a rigid silence. Whilst labouring under this "strong delusion," she was permitted to attend the public service; but when the congregation stood up to *sing*, her mouth too was opened: From that moment the spell was broken, and she was restored to her joyful family.

truth ;" and that the one is by no means incompatible with the other.

I much fear that the "opinions" of our unmusical Editor in this matter, will tend to give encouragement to the modern class of "intellect" worshippers, men who deify the human understanding, and bow down with the odious Gallican revolutionists before the shrine of the goddess of *reason* ; men who idolize an abstraction, which is nevertheless as much an idol as the image which Nebuchadnezzar set up in the plains of Dura. For, be it noted, that as to avoid the charge of puritanism, he on the one hand repudiates the old watch word *carnality* ; so on the other he is equally shy of its old opponent *spirituality*. He would have it that religion is confined to the *intellect*, thereby excluding not the body only, but the *affections* likewise from any participation in holy offices. But I think I need not step out of my proper province to go about to write a book to prove that the proper seat of religion is rather in the *affections* than in the *understanding* ; and that Christianity craves admission into the *heart* rather than the *head*. True it disclaims not the helps of reason, but it certainly does not *rest* there. The element of religion is *love* ; and it remains with the STANDARD to show that love is an attribute of the intellect, excepting perhaps the love of abstract truth. "Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thy *heart*, and with all thy *soul*, and with all thy *mind*," is "the first and great commandment." Our most holy religion thus evidently and demonstrably claims its place in our *affections*. Now I think

that enough has been before advanced, satisfactorily to show that music has a peculiar influence and power over the affections, the *expediency* of its employment in sacred offices therefore can no longer be questioned. We shall see hereafter what can be said for its lawfulness.

The sort of philosophical or *intellectual* religion I have spoken of is almost as ancient as heresy itself. Here I must be allowed to introduce a long quotation from that admirable work, "a Treatise concerning the Lawfulness of Instrumental Musick in Holy Offices," by Henry Dodwell, M. A. printed 1700, a work which I particularly recommend to the diligent study of the Editor of the STANDARD.

"The Scripture is not more express in requiring a *Spiritual* Worship, than it is in requiring that also of the *Body*. Our *Bodies* are *Temples of the Holy Ghost*, and we are accordingly required to *Glorifie God in our Bodies* as well as our *Spirits which are his*, 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. *The unmarried Woman* is so to care for the things of the Lord, that she may be Holy, both in *Body* and in *Spirit*, vii. 34. We are to present our *Bodies a living Sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is our reasonable Service*. Rom. xii. 1. And our *whole Spirit, and Soul, and Body, are to be preserved Blameless unto the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*. 1 Thess. v. 23. If Service be expected from the *Body* as well as the *Spirit*, How can it be disagreeable to the Nature of our *Spiritual* Religion, that such parts of *Bodily* Worship may be retained or introduced as may in their own Nature contribute to the Worship of the *Spirit*? There was indeed near the *Apostles* times, an *Opinion* introduced among the *Philosophers*, *Numenius* perhaps may be the first that brought it in, from whom *Porphyry* owns *Plotinus* to have borrowed what he has to this purpose, That the *Soul* alone was the *Man*, and that the *Body* was no part of the *Man*, but a Prison to the *Soul*, and therefore preternatural to it, and to be avoided by it, that it might be qualified for a perfect State. And these did indeed so insist on the *Spiritual* Nature of Religion, as to discharge the *Body* from any share in it. The *Good Man* with them was the only Priest, the *Soul* itself the only acceptable Temple, the Devotion of the Mind the pleasing Sacrifice. And the way to union with God, was to alienate themselves as much as was possible from the *Body*, and from the *external So-*

cieties of Men, and to enure themselves to abstracted Operations of the Mind, in order to the cultivating of the Spirit, which was the only Power that they thought capable of an Union with the Supreme Being. This is that *Philosophical Religion* so much Celebrated by *Plotinus*, *Porphyry* himself, and *Hierocles*, and several other of the later Philosophers. *Porphyry* particularly was very much pleased with it, as appears from his Sentences, and his Books *de Abstinentiâ*, but especially from his Epistle to *Anebo*, where he does by these Principles undermine all Obligation to the *Externals* of the *Heathen*, as well as the *Christian Religion*. This put him on Starving himself in his *Lilybæan Retirement*, if his Master *Plotinus* (whom he followed in these Opinions) had not reclaimed him. This seems to be the Original of all that *Enthusiasm* that has decryed the external Ordinances and Sacraments even of *Christ* himself, upon Pretences to greater Perfection, and several Fancies of the old *Monks* relating this way in *Anastatius Sinaita*; of the Popish *Mystical Divinity* and *Quietism*, of the *Familists* and *Quakers*, of the *Bourignonists* and *Philadelphians*," &c.—p. 51.

"For us it is abundantly sufficient that this Doctrine, though taught by the Adversaries of the Apostles Age, was notwithstanding perfectly different from the Sense of the *Apostolical Church* itself. The *Hereticks* by this means evaded the *Resurrection* of the *Body*, pretending the *Resurrection* promised was already past, in their *mystical Resurrection* from Sin. For the rising of the *Body* could not be thought a Reward, if the being in the *Body* was preternatural, and a State of Punishment. Thence also it proceeded, that so many of these first *Hereticks* defiled the *Flesh*, as not belonging to them, and condemned *Marriage*, as contributing to confine Souls to Bodies, upon this very Pretence of their being themselves *Spiritual*, and being therefore for a more *Spiritual* way of Worship."—p. 52.

Our present adversary, I presume, has hardly gone so far as that yet; but he may see which way the road he has set out upon may conduct him.

Having thus, as I hope, satisfactorily, disposed of the charge of sensuality, I proceed to the next head of indictment, viz. that "music cannot fail to *deform*" those portions of the church service with which it is usually associated. But music, it seems, is not to stand alone in this charge, as "any other added ornament," (granting by the way that music *is* an ornament,) is included in the same predicament. If so,

then graceful and dignified elocution in pronouncing them would be equally objectionable; and any variety of accent and emphasis must be interdicted from the reading desk. But possibly the writer perceived not the full force of his own proposition; I will not therefore urge this point, but return to music. He particularly instances the "*Te Deum*," "*Jubilate*," and "*Nunc Dimitis*," as portions of the service "so eloquent, so full of masculine dignity in their composition, that *music cannot fail to deform them*." Now in his commendation of our church service, I do most cordially concur. But I do not think that he has manifested his usual tact in particularizing the "*Jubilate*" as being necessarily *deformed* by music, seeing that at its very commencement we find the words, "Serve the Lord with gladness, and *come before his presence with a song*." Could he possibly have forgotten this? After all, this objection is a mere matter of opinion; and I am content to take part with the sentiment of the universal Christian church, rather than with the dictum of the STANDARD. I refer the reader therefore to some of the previous quotations, and for the present pass on to the next charge, which is—that the people of England are not musical; and that the great majority feel even a small infusion of music in church services an obstruction rather than an aid to their devotions. That there *are* people in this country (as also, I presume in all other countries,) who do not like music of any kind or in any degree; and that the Editor of the STANDARD is one of those unhappy individuals, I will not attempt to

deny, nay, I will declare my belief that the assertion is perfectly true. The temperament of such men does not harmonize with the common constitution of humanity, insomuch that an old writer (not a musician) puts these words into the mouth of *Nature* personified, **If I made any one which cannot brook or fancy Musicke, surely I erred and made a monster.** But to affirm that these constitute the *majority*, and that they even amount to “nineteen-twentieths of the population” is—putting it in the mildest terms—to say *the thing that is not*. “Experience has proved (says Gibbon) that the mechanical operation of sounds, by quickening the circulation of the blood and spirits, will act on the human machine more forcibly than the eloquence of reason and honour.”—[Decline and Fall, vol. xii.] And Rollin, in his History of the Arts and Sciences, speaking of music, says,

“This exercise has in all times been the delight of all nations, of the most barbarous, as well as of those who valued themselves most upon their civility. And it must be confessed, that the Author of nature has implanted in man a taste and secret tendency for song and harmony.”

Does this prove the existence of any thing like a general distaste for musical pleasures? But perhaps our Editor confines the assertion to the people of this country only, and at this present time. Well; there too I meet him, with the *fact*,—that the announcement of a musical performance in a church, especially if gratuitous, is a most certain means of bringing together a crowded congregation, and that the humbler classes will enter into its composition in the full proportion of their relative numbers and

opportunity of obtaining accommodation. What is more; I do very much question whether a piano-forte, or some other musical instrument, may not at the present moment be found in every second house throughout the kingdom. If, however, our adversary will not take a declaration on the subject, he may soon satisfy himself by (what he has once or twice appealed to) his own "experience." Let him procure a great drum, and a set of pandæan pipes, and after having attained but a moderate degree of proficiency in the command of his *instruments*, let him sally from his office, and commence his public performance in the streets; and—barring always the interference of the police—he will soon find himself surrounded by a "list'ning crowd" of admiring auditors, consisting exclusively too of the "humbler classes." If, after all, he will not be convinced, I shall give him up as incorrigible. Certain it is that the number of church organs has of late years been wonderfully increased, and—as we shall find shortly—that the dissenters are not much behind us in the matter: I leave him to determine whether this be a sign that the people generally find a small infusion of instrumental music to be a hindrance rather than an aid to their religious contemplations.

I am much pleased at one admission of the opponent, viz. that he has observed—no doubt with dismay—"a strong disposition amongst some of the *best ministers of the church* to increase the quantity" of music in the parochial service. Surely I cannot err *very* egregiously in following the example of "the

best ministers of the church," in manifesting my "disposition to increase" rather than to diminish the quantity of church music.

The argument drawn from one of Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions to her Clergy [the forty-ninth, which having been cited in almost every publication on Church music, need not to be here recited,] is even yet more easily met. The Editor of the *STANDARD* would fain thence infer that the Church of England is opposed to the introduction of music, other than the plainest species of metrical psalmody, in parochial worship. But, what are the facts? They are, first, that the injunction in question was "designed *primarily* for the *protection* of *Cathedral Music*,"⁵ and concludes with a *permission*, [mark! reader,] simply a *permission*, "for the comforting of such as delight in music" (of that description) to sing "a hymn or such like song," "in the beginning or at the end of Common Prayers." So far indeed is that very injunction from discountenancing music generally; that it is rather a provision for its maintenance, than an order for its discontinuance. What mean else such expressions as these?

The lawdable science of Musicke hath been had in estimation, and preserved in knowledge: again, The Queene's maiestie neyther meanyng in any wise the decaye of any thinge that myght conveniently tende to the use and continuance of the laide science, neyther to have the same in any parte so abused in the churche, that thereby the common prayer shoulde be the worse understood of the hearers: Wyllleth and commandeth that fyrst no alteration be made of such assignmentes of lybynge as heretofore hath been appointed to the use of syngynge or mulicke in the churche, but the same so remayne.

⁵ Inquiry into Historical Facts relative to Parochial Psalmody: York, 1821.

And this is in perfect keeping with the known character and habits of England's virgin Queen, for it is notorious that she was a musical woman, and performed upon keyed instruments passages which it would puzzle most musicians in the present day to execute.

But laying aside this *permission* of the employment of metrical psalmody, we will advert to the general directions of the rubrick. And here we find various portions of the service ordered to be "said or sung:" in some instances indeed to be "sung or said," as though thereby to intimate a preference for one mode of delivery above the other. Indeed, in a prayer book "Imprinted at London by BONHAM NORTON and JOHN BILL, MDC.XXIII," I find the following:

"¶ And (to the end the people may the better heare,) in such places where they doe sing, there shall the Lessons be sung in a plaine tune, after the manner of distinct reading, and likewise the Epistle and Gospel."

If further proof were wanting, that the Church of England does not disapprove the employment of music, vocal and instrumental, it may be found in her constant usage from the time of the Reformation to the present moment; more particularly in her Cathedral service, (her "most public form of worship") and Chapels Royal, where it has received the successive sanction of every one of her temporal monarchs; whereas, our *customary* parochial music has, to this day, nothing better than an implied permission, to authenticate its pretensions.

"The description of singing which the Church of England has authorized, is at this day confined principally to Cathedrals and

Collegiate Chapels, whilst in Parish Churches an unauthorized metrical Psalmody is practised. This is a circumstance to be regretted; because the best metrical translations of the Psalms must always be greatly inferior to the authorized proze version, *pointed* to be sung in our Churches."⁶

"There is little hope of the general restoration of Church Music in our parochial service. Yet in the Parish Churches of many of our principal towns, the practice of that music, has, within the last thirty years, been revived; and the Congregations join in chanting the *Venite Exultemus*, the *Te Deum* and *Jubilate*, the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc Dimittis*, with a happy and devotional effect. In proportion as the usage of the primitive ages is copied; in proportion likewise as the rites of the Church are respected, the structure of her poetry attended to, and her music duly appreciated, this mode of singing will be preferred above Metrical Psalmody."⁷

I could not resist the temptation to insert the foregoing paragraph, (although it does deviate a little from my prescribed track,) seeing that it makes particular mention of the "happy and devotional effect" produced by the singing of those very portions of the Church service, which—according to our much misled Editor—music must certainly tend to *deform*. And the following paragraph from another work is equally appropriate.

"For the indiscriminate rejection of choral music, as such, there are *few* in these days so fanatical as to contend; and those abuses of it being guarded against, with which it has been sometimes chargeable, men of pious and enlarged minds will subscribe to the following praise of it contained in the Book of Ceremonies, which was published in 1539, during the reign of Henry VIIIth. 'The sober, discreet, and devout singing, music, and playing with organs, used in the church, in the service of God, are ordained to move and stir the people to the sweetness of God's word, the which is there sung: and by that sweet harmony both to excite them to prayer and devotion, and also to put them in remembrance of the heavenly triumphant church, where is everlasting joy, continual laud, and praise to God.'"—Kennedy's "Thoughts on Psalmody," Longman, 1821, p. 16.

⁶ "Inquiry into the Historical Facts relative to Parochial Psalmody."—p. 8.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 9.

Enough has been adduced to prove that the Church of England does not disallow the use of music, vocal or instrumental; plain song, or the full burst of choral harmony; so as that only the *words* be “understood of the people,” for which due care is always taken.

Having thus briefly discussed the objections of the Editor of the *STANDARD* to the use of music generally in holy offices; and, as I trust, proved that they have warrant neither in reason, nor in Scripture, nor in the usage of our Church, I will put it to him, how—supposing his objections to be all well founded, and demonstrable,—*how* he can possibly accommodate it to his conscience to allow the propriety of continuing music in *Cathedrals*, whereas he would banish it (as sensual) from *parish Churches*? I will not attempt to answer the question, for if the employment of music in the one case be sinful, it must be *doubly* so in the other.

To advert to what has been alleged against the “church organ,”—that it deprives the people of the interest which they might otherwise take in the vocal part of the service,—I am perfectly willing to concede to the antagonist that a wretched instrument, under the fingers of a more wretched organist,—or what is nick-named a *grinder*,—or even a first-rate organ unskilfully or indevoutly managed, may produce that unhappy effect. I have, ere now, witnessed some miserable exhibitions of this kind in parish churches, aye, even in cathedrals also. And what wonder, when the ordinary services of the week are so frequently left under the controul of half-grown and half-taught

striplings; and when religious qualifications are so inconsiderately kept, either almost or altogether, out of sight in the appointment to what ought to be deemed a religious as well as a musical office? But what then? Surely this may be pronounced "*vitium hominum non artis*," the blame attaches to the performer and to those who conferred upon him the appointment. It is "a sore evil," but with which neither the art nor the instrument is justly chargeable. False doctrine may have been frequently propounded from certain pulpits; but is preaching therefore to be denounced?

That instrumental music has not *universally* this unhappy effect, I hope I have already adduced sufficient evidence to prove. If more were required, it might be found in the appeal to the fact, that organs in churches and chapels are and have been, in by far the great majority of instances, set up by the voluntary contributions of the people, and that their number is constantly increasing.

Lord Althorp, by his scheme for the annihilation of church rates, at one fell swoop cuts off, (and without "compensation" too) the revenue heretofore derived to our parochial musicians from that source, and leaves them entirely at the mercy of the "voluntary principal;" and the Editor of the *STANDARD* seconds the motion by suggesting the propriety of turning organs and organists adrift, and sending music to the —— the theatre, or any other place, rather than the house of God. But can he seriously think that this would be a means of increasing the congre-

gations? Is it not on the contrary notorious that music operates as an attraction; and that vast numbers of so-called *protestants* are induced to attend the worship of the *popish mass*, from no other motive on earth than a love of the exquisite music with which it is sometimes accompanied? If these things be so, what justification is there of the assertion that the organ "repels" the people?

Time was, when the objection to the organ rested upon the assumption of its *popish* extraction, on which Mr. Newte writes thus:

"And what does it matter if some few inharmonious Souls do dislike the Organs in our Church, as some others through Prejudice dislike our Church Service; and both through extreme Ignorance or an ill Design, account them Popery. Will it be reasonable to expect our Governours should so far neglect their Duty to the Church, and their regard to the most considerable Body of Protestants, to gratify these few, by altering the one, and laying aside the other?"

The same clergyman speaks more expressly to a matter of *fact* connected with the erection of an organ.

"I can with the greatest satisfaction say, That I verily believe since the late erecting of the *Organ* in our Parish-Church of *Tiverton*, and *much by the means of it*, we have as *Regular and decent*, and I hope as *Devout* a Congregation as any in the whole Diocess." —Pref. to Dodwell's Treatise, p. 83.

But what if it should turn out that the employment of music, both vocal and instrumental, in the service of God, is not only lawful and expedient, but even *commanded*. This may sound very strangely in the ears of the unmusical minority, and perhaps equally so in those of the party opposed to them. It is made out as follows:

I am of opinion that few of our adversaries can answer this reason, which seemeth to me a general rule, & infallible demonstration for the allowing as well of the running and ex-

quisite art of singing, as of the use of organs and dumbe instruments. The Psalmes may bee used in the Church as the author of them appointed: But the Holy Ghost, the author of the Psalmes, appointed & commanded them by the Prophet David, to be song, and to be song most cunningly, and to be song with diverse artificiall instruments of Musick, and to be song with sundry, severall, and most excellent notes & tunes: Therefore in our English Church, the psalmes may be song, and song most cunningly, and with diverse artificiall instruments of Musick, and song with sundry, severall and most excellent notes. For proove that the Holy Ghost would have them song, hee calleth diverse Psalmes by the name of the Hebrew word Shir, which is a song, and such a song as ought of necessity to be song; as Psalm 7 and 120. That he would have them song most cunningly, hee directed many Psalmes especially and by name Lamnazzeath, that is, to the skillfull chanter, or to him that excelleth in Musicke, as Psalm 4, &c. That he would have them song, with diverse artificiall instruments of Musick, gittith and neginoth, and diverse other kinds of musicall instruments are expressed in the titles of certain Psalmes, as Psalm 6 & 8. That he would have them song with sundry severall and most excellent notes and varietie of tunes, in diverse parts & places of sundry Psalmes, it is to be seene by the word Sela set downe in sundry places, as Psalm 77, &c. which Hebrew word properly signifieth, now change your voice and that cunningly, now lift up your voice, and that with another excellent tune, that the people may be more attentive; and the word Sela is never written but where the matter of the Psalm is most notable.⁸

These are the words of a physician, and his book is so entertaining, so convincing, and so rare, that I could feel it in my heart—would my limits permit—to transcribe some chapters entire. That he was far from concurring with the opinion of the STANDARD that music tends to drive people from the church is evident from the following:

If there were no other reason, yet this were of sufficient force to perfwade the lawful use of Musicke: in that as a pleasant bait, it doeth both allure men into the church which otherwise would not come, and cauleth them which are there to continue till the divine service bee ended.⁹

⁸ Praise of Musicke, p. 138.

⁹ Ibid, p. 151.

But, the STANDARD alleges, that the organ not only drives the people away from the church, but drives them into the meeting house; and, (can it be possible?) into even "much worse places." Thus is the poor organ openly charged with the sin of schism! A grave charge truly; and gravely shall it be answered. First, by a determinate denial of the facts alleged. I affirm that I have *known*, (this is not mere matter of *opinion*)—I have known many dissenters attracted to the Church of England service, "not for the doctrine, but the music there," and thus brought into occasional conformity, to say the least. Nay, further, I have known some of these permanently to attach themselves to our communion.¹ What says the STANDARD to this? It refused to give currency to the statement, because it contradicted a hasty and ill-judged "opinion." Let be—I will offer the Edi-

¹ Neither let this be deemed a thing incredible, seeing that they who come under the sound of the church organ are equally so under that of the voice of the officiating clergyman; and being prepared by the one, may, (under the Divine blessing) be convinced by the other.

I may adduce a remarkable instance of the power of music in enforcing a *doctrinal* sentiment. The late Mr. George W——ne, of the city of Bristol, a man of most unblemished moral integrity, but by religious profession a Socinian, was an enthusiastical admirer of the music of Händel, and particularly of his master-piece—the Messiah. He was accustomed to say, that if when he was present at the performance of the sublime chorus, "For unto us a child is born;" and if at the precise moment of the striking out of the *kettle drums*, (at the words "Wonderful, Counsellor, the *mighty God*," &c.) any one should venture to charge him with not being a Calvinist, (meaning thereby no more than a believer in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity) *he would knock him down*. From what passed upon his death-bed, I have good reason to believe that he at last died in "the faith once delivered to the saints," in other words, relying upon the merits of a Saviour whose Godhead he had previously acknowledged only when under the influence of sacred music.

tor a little cup of consolation, although I am afraid he will find something bitter in one of the ingredients of the potion. Let him then take all the comfort he can derive from the assurance, that the organ is rapidly becoming as common a piece of furniture in the dissenting chapels as it has been wont to be in a church. Within a week after the publication of the *dissenting* article in the STANDARD, which has elicited these remarks, I was called upon by two bodies of dissenters, one in this city, and the other forty miles distant, to advise with them concerning the erection of organs in their respective chapels; and since that time another instance of the same sort has occurred. At this rate our unharmonized Editor, in a short time, will scarcely be able to find a place of public worship in which to rest his unmusical ears, unless he betake himself in the last resort to the Quakers' meeting house, where he may enjoy silence to his heart's content. The growing prevalence of organs must at all events remove from them the charge of promoting schism in the church; for if they originally tended to repel people from the church to the dissenting chapel, they may now naturally be expected to drive them back again. But no; our antagonist has a happy reserve in his provision of "much worse places," by which, as I before intimated, I presume he must mean beer-houses, &c. He that can believe it, let him. But I must be allowed to suggest the possibility that the actuating motive of the parties frequenting such "much worse places than dissenting chapels," may be that there is an *attractive* power in

some enjoyment real or imaginary there obtainable, not a *repelling* power in the church or the chapel organ.

But more gravely. I do seriously admonish the Editor of the STANDARD of the fact, that the dissenters are and for some years have been in the habit of paying considerable attention to the cultivation of congregational and choral music, as a means at once of edification and of delight. Many of the clergy, and, (as the STANDARD observes) of the "*best of the clergy*" are alive to the circumstance, and *therefore* they encourage the increase of parochial music. I am happy to be able to adduce the evidence of one of the number. The Rev. Rann Kennedy, A. M. of Birmingham, goes so far as to advise the formation of a society "for promoting church music, which should bear some resemblance, (and perhaps should be joined) to the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge." After some remarks upon the objects to be pursued by such a society, and the beneficial results to which he thinks it would conduce, he says,

"These considerations, of moment at all times, are particularly seasonable at the present, when new churches are on the point of being erected in all the populous districts of the kingdom, and *when we are learning from experience and observation, what effects are produced out of the pale of the Establishment, by an earnest, unremitting, and, I must add, laudable application to the point in question.* But without looking to the conduct of others, it becomes us, as Members of the Church of England, and as Christians, not to forget what we owe to ourselves; and in this view, every suggestion will be candidly received, nor can any thing be 'deemed *little*, which conduces, in any degree, to so *great* an end, as is the decent and orderly performance of the public worship of God.'"—"See Bishop Gibson's Charge."²

² Thoughts on the music and words of Psalmody, Longman, 1821.

If, upon this point, the evidence of the dissenters themselves will be considered conclusive, (as I suppose it will,) it shall be produced. I will cite for this purpose the *Eclectic Review*, a work devoted to the cause of dissent. I will quote from it first a paragraph, giving something like a history of the gradual introduction of instrumental music into their services.

"It was a dry remark of a Protestant Clergyman of a foreign communion, himself no mean composer, that the Reformation in England was a very good thing, only it spoiled all our music. There are many persons on both sides of the Tweed, who will think that it would hardly have deserved the name of a Reformation had it spared our Church music. The white shirt is not more abominable to the true-bred disciples of Knox or Cameron, than the 'box of whistles;' and a stringed instrument would scarcely excite less horror in an antiburgher kirk, than a crucifix. And though the prejudice has never perhaps been quite so strong among us, yet, till very recently, all sorts of instrumental accompaniments were regarded by Dissenters in general, as utterly Jewish or Popish in their character, and unseemly in Christian worship. Of late years, however, innovations have been creeping in among us. On the plea of necessity or of expediency, the modest flute has been suffered to perform the functions of the pitch-pipe, and to keep the choir in tune. The violoncello has gained admission, in other places, on the same plausible pretext. By and by, both have been tolerated, or the clarionet has taken the place of the flute, as the bassoon is the substitute for the bass viol. We have actually heard three different instruments; and indeed, as Rippon's tune-book gives the Alto and Counter-tenor of the airs, it is naturally concluded on that high authority, that there is nothing to forbid their being sung and supported in the same way as the undeniably orthodox bass. Thus choirs and bands have been formed, and at length, in several popular chapels—far be from ears polite the old-fashioned term meeting-house—the experiment has been made, and has succeeded, of introducing an organ."—Vol. XX. p. 214.

The reviewer then deprecates the vile taste manifested in the selection of tunes at that time usually performed; and, speaking of Dr. Watts, says that were he to rise from the grave, "it would sorely disquiet his spirit, to hear some of his own psalms and

hymns performed to the tunes of our modern *discomposers*," which I dare say is perfectly true; and afterwards enters very fairly into the question concerning "the lawfulness of instrumental music in Christian assemblies," which he syllogistically decides in the affirmative. There are many passages in the same article which I had marked for insertion, but I must content myself with taking two or three.

"The Quakers are the most consistent anti-harmonists; they content themselves with making melody in their hearts,—with the music of the spheres, and banish instruments, and music, and singing together. Assuredly, when instruments are banished, music will not be long after them."—p. 216.

"The long divorce which both the science and the practice of music have suffered from its genuine purpose, has well nigh obliterated, in the minds of most persons, all idea of its Divine origin, and, with that, all sense of the wisdom and goodness displayed in that law of our physical constitution on which it depends. It is thought of as the mere invention of man, being identified with the abuses to which it has been perverted, rather than with its true design. Man, however, was no more the author of the musical scale, than he was of the rainbow."—p. 218.

"It is no more a human invention, than the Divine gift of speech."

"It must be admitted, however, that any thing like music is seldom attainable [in public worship] without the aid of an organ."—p. 219.

"It is not that the instrument is indispensable to the physical performance of the vocal worship, but it is all but morally necessary to its due performance;—*necessary to the maintenance of a devotional taste in our congregations*, in connexion with genuine musical feeling, and in a word, to the very existence of church music."—p. 220.

This was published several years ago, and the extracts which I have made will certainly show that the Dissenters were, at that time, fast beginning to be aware of the value of devotional music. Much miserable composition is, however, still in use amongst them, but this is an evil which it will take long time to eradicate. To change the *tunes* in use among a Christian community, is a work of as much difficulty

as changing the currency of an empire. The singing too may be presumed to be occasionally as repulsive to a chastened ear, as a church organ to the Editor of the STANDARD, judging from the following anecdote :

"Often has the exclamation of good old John Ryland, of Northampton, on one occasion, occurred to us : 'Do ye call that singing? If the angels in heaven were to hear ye, they would come down and wring your necks off!' "—p. 219.

and it is to avoid such unseemly exhibitions as these, that the reviewer recommends the use of the organ, and the appointment of an organist of "a decidedly religious character;" a suggestion which no Christian can disapprove.

And now, on closing this part of the subject, I would very respectfully remind the Editor of the STANDARD, that music has peculiar claims upon *his* kind consideration and regard, as being decidedly *conservative* in its character and essence. In its origin co-eval with religion itself, connected with holy offices from the creation to the present hour, and in prospective duration co-extensive with the eternal joys of the heavenly hosts;—it surely could not have been expected that it would find an opponent in a man, who allows *any thing* to plead precedent, authority, or prescription. But more;—involving, both in its principles and in its practice, the very elements of peace, happiness, and civil government,—order, harmony, the due subordination of parts each to other, and the subjection of the whole to one sovereign influence or presiding power,—it ought rather to call

forth his warmest eulogium, than to excite his indignant opposition. He will see that I do *not* call him "a Goth," (the Goths indeed were not discouragers of music,) nor any other hard name; no, I simply say, as I did in the letter which he refused to publish, that I fear he is labouring under mental alienation, "mad upon one idea," and I pray God that he may shortly be found "sitting, and in his right mind;" to which happy end, perhaps his attendance on the performances at Westminster Abbey may materially conduce.

In addressing myself to the subject of the approaching Royal Musical Festival—a subject which I heartily wish had been taken up by some one more immediately interested in it, for I have "no lot or part in this matter,"—I shall, for brevity's sake, take the liberty of placing the Editor of the *RECORD* by the side of him of the *STANDARD*, in order thereby to have the opportunity of "killing two birds with one stone," although, I assure both the gentlemen concerned, I have no wish to do them any harm bodily or spiritual, or—to speak in more modern phrase—"sensual" or "intellectual."

Thus runs the editorial duet.

STANDARD.—It is "employing a church as a place of sensual recreation."

RECORD.—It is "an exhibition intended to gratify the senses."

S.—It is making the church "a place for the collection of money, received in consideration of enjoyment."

R.—"A place of theatrical entertainment."

S.—It is an "application to *secular uses* of things usually devoted to religion."

R.—Thereby “*deseccrated* to purposes of pleasure” and “amusement.”

S.—“A muster of singers and fiddlers in one of the principal temples.”

R.—“The performers of the Opera-house.”

So far they pipe in concert. But here some passages are contrasted.

STANDARD.—Change the *place*, and “all occasion of offence would be removed. The purpose of the celebration is *good*—the celebration itself *blameless*.”

Not so the RECORD.

“The sacred mysteries of revelation are degraded to the level of opera songs.” “The true character of these festivals has been manifested. The ‘revelling and banquetting’ with which they are associated, the masquerading, the dancing, the dissipation, proclaim in language too plain to be mistaken, that these festivals are not of God, but of the world, and therefore the world hears them.”

In order to disentangle from their confusion these charges against musical festivals, and to include every allegation of the accusers, I shall consider the objections, *seriatim*, as relating to the following heads:—the object sought,—the subject matter of the performances,—the alleged adjuncts,—the actuating principles of the assembly,—and lastly, the locality of the celebration: and although, in the discussion of some of these points, some considerations connected with others of them will almost necessarily be involved, yet I will endeavour, for perspicuity’s sake, as much as may be to treat them separately. I must premise, that it is my design to attempt to defend Musical Festivals, as far as they are connected with the *Church*, and no farther; and I trust that the really candid reader will soon find that I am no

advocate for abuses, although of course I cannot be supposed to entertain a wish to render them unduly prominent.

First, then, the *object* sought to be attained by the celebration of what is usually denominated a Musical Festival, is, on the part of the founders and promoters, I believe, usually two-fold; the enlargement of the funds of some charitable institution; and next, confessedly as the attractive or *extractive* means, the "gratification," "pleasure," or "enjoyment," to be thence derived. Upon the first of these, our adversaries are discreetly silent; well knowing that the attempt to stop the current of humanity would have met with the overwhelming indignation of all rightly ordered intelligences. The heartless doctrine, that it is improper to raise funds for charitable purposes, not having been broached, the less need be said in defence of the practice. The *effects* may be read in the financial accounts of many of those noble institutions, which are justly esteemed the most glorious ornaments of our beloved country. Still if the means employed be in their own nature culpable, the application of the money so obtained will not render them otherwise; else might the highwayman justify his "profession" by bestowing the proceeds of his last robbery to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked.³

³ This paragraph was written before I was aware of the fact, that it is intended to devote a portion of the proceeds of the Royal Musical Festival to the *Royal Academy of Music*, which I presume cannot be considered merely as a *charitable* institution. This must be deemed a misapplication of funds raised in a church, which ought to be devoted exclusively to benevolent or religious purposes.

We come therefore to the consideration of the means, which according to our opponents are not simply "pleasure," or "enjoyment," but "sensual recreation," "*amusement*," or "*theatrical entertainment*." The term "*sensual*" has been, as I hope, already disposed of; and, to clear the ground, it would be as well to get rid next of the term "*theatrical*." How such a word chanced to creep in, I am at some loss to imagine. I can only consider it as an expletive; so many syllables casually inserted by the Editor of the RECORD *in furore scribendi*, wherewithal the better to round a period, or according to the understood license of an accuser, to aggravate the charge; a count in the indictment, not intended to be proved. Or would he prove it thus?—Some of the performers have musical engagements at the *theatres*, therefore the performance in which they are engaged in the church, is also *theatrical*. If this be good, will he allow the force of another? Many, probably the great majority, of the performers, have musical engagements in *churches*, therefore the performance is *sacred*. He knows well that the argument is untenable, and that were all the stage players in the kingdom forthwith to turn tailors, and commence operations with thimbles and shears, in the room of the unionists who have "struck," that would not conjure the act of making or mending a pair of breeches, into a theatrical entertainment. If, however, he allude to the structure of the oratorio as having a slight analogy with that of a dramatic poem, I leave him to take the full benefit of the objection

after he shall have duly perused all the commentators upon the *book of Job*.

And now, having removed the qualifying epithets, we come to the gist of the opponent's objection, which is, that musical festivals are sought as sources of "pleasure," "enjoyment," "gratification," "recreation," "entertainment," and "amusement;" and that *such* pleasure, &c. is blameworthy. Two or three of these words, are evidently inappropriate, and have been thrust into the charge for the purpose of degrading the subject. Music, as we have seen, is destined to subserve much higher purposes than those of mere sport and pastime; although even as such merely, a musical festival in any other *place* than a church, and devoted to any other *subject* than religion, would perhaps be defensible. I concede to the opponent, most honestly, that if it could be made to appear that the frequenters of sacred festivals go thither for the simple object of *amusement*, they commit a great abomination; and as far as in them lies, they *do* desecrate the sacred edifice. The same, however, may be said of an unhappy multitude of persons, who it is to be feared are induced to attend the discourses of popular preachers, from no higher motive. The sin is their own, and theirs will be the punishment. But who ever thought of therefore interdicting sacred oratory? We may next hear it proposed to omit the celebration of the Holy Communion, because some unworthy partakers "eat and drink to their own damnation." But this desire of mere amusement is by no means common to *all* who

frequent musical festivals; it is not, I would fain hope, the attribute of even a great majority of them. The important religious uses to which music may be lawfully applied, have already been descanted on; and who shall be bold enough to say that it is unlawful or improper to take pleasure in "performing," or in listening to the performance of, that which may lawfully enter into our most solemn devotional engagements? This description of "pleasure" it is which is anticipated and experienced by a very large class of persons who go to music-meetings; it is such as that which induced the pious poet, George Herbert, of old, to repair twice a week to a distant cathedral to attend the service there, of which he was accustomed to say, that "it elevated his soul, and was his heaven upon earth;" it is a noble heightening of the best and most holy affections of the human heart, a pleasure which nothing earthly can bestow, a purely *religious* enjoyment—to be experienced before it can be understood. The STANDARD perhaps will continue to esteem all this mere "excitement." Let it be so. I am content to employ the same species of excitement with those happy spirits who are in the more immediate presence of God himself, "at whose right hand there are *pleasures* for evermore." When the soul is duly attuned to our Redeemer's praise, it will take delight in hearing His glory and His wonderful works proclaimed and celebrated by "every thing that hath breath;" and will feel that by no human means can it be done so affectingly, (I do not say *acceptably*) as by a "great congregation," assembled

for that very purpose, in a temple dedicated to His service. When a sacred musical festival ceases to be defensible upon such high ground as this, I shall cease to be its advocate.

The next point, against which one of our adversaries has levelled his attack, is, the *subject matter* of the performances usual on such an occasion, viz. "the sacred mysteries of revelation," in other words, "the sublime language of scripture." This indeed generally is, and always *ought* to be, the subject of the sacred musician's exercises. And what nobler subjects can occupy his contemplations, engage his heart and his pen, or set his voice and his hand in motion? But it is "*desecrated* to purposes of pleasure," says the RECORD. Alas! alas! it is too true that sinful man cannot participate in anything that is sacred, without in some sense desecrating it. We defile all that we touch, and—having done all—are but "unprofitable servants" at the very best. But this, perhaps, is not the sense in which the Editor of the RECORD would have us to understand his phrase—"desecrated to purposes of pleasure." The nature of the pleasure sought, has already passed under review; that part of the subject therefore shall not be re-opened. Possibly, however, the Editor alludes to the choice of certain subjects of oratorios, which subjects he may judge to be altogether unfit for musical accompaniment, and therefore desecrated by such a conjunction. I know that many religiously-disposed persons, both musical and unmusical, have entertained the same scruple; and therefore I the more willingly enter

upon its consideration. The subjects particularly referred to are—the denunciations of the Divine law, —the awful manifestations of the Almighty's wrath, —the sufferings and death of our crucified Redeemer, —and the terrific solemnities of the resurrection and last judgment, all of which have been made the ground-work of harmony. This view of sacred oratorios was taken up half a century ago, by the late Rev. John Newton, at that time Rector of St. Mary Woolnoth, Lombard Street; who, in a passage replete with eloquence and serious sarcasm, likens the people of his generation, who flocked to Westminster Abbey to hear the *Messiah* performed, to a set of criminals, who, having been committed upon the charge of high treason, *amused* themselves in prison by setting to music, and having performed for their *amusement*, the solemnities of their approaching trial, &c.⁴ The whole force of the ridicule, it is evident, hinges upon the word “amusement:” substitute for it any other which shall imply their making use of the most powerful means to impress their minds with a due sense of their perilous situation; and although the comparison is rendered more perfect, the sarcasm has vanished. Still, as I have already intimated, as there does exist in certain minds a strong impression of the impropriety of employing music in connexion with such topics, I will enter into the subject a little more at large.

⁴ *Messiah*. Fifty expository discourses on the Oratorio of Handel, preached in 1784 and 1785. Published in 2 vols. 1786. The passage referred to above is the commencement of the fourth sermon.

I will acknowledge at the outset that there are some subjects, which in their own nature are much better adapted to musical expression, and the chastened feelings which music is best suited to produce, than others. Thus, the grateful ascription of praise to the Giver of all good, is far more appropriate than the denunciation of wrath and destruction; the happiness of the saints in bliss, than the torments of Tophet. How, indeed, it could have entered into the brain of a modern composer to take the delivery of the law upon *Mount Sinai* as the subject of an oratorio, I cannot imagine; but as the product is neither popular, nor likely to be so, I need not enlarge upon it. The best method of determining what subjects are proper or improper, as applied to musical purposes, is a direct appeal to the authority of Holy Writ. Accordingly therein we find, as the grand theme and universally pervading principle of every passage so applied, "the praise and glory of God." This also either is or ought to be the pervading topic of every sacred oratorio. This omitted, certainly it should have no place in the church. But besides this grand theme, there will be found to be other subordinate subjects continually introduced by the inspired musicians of old, as also by the celestial choir in glory. Some of the psalms refer in exulting terms to the destruction of the enemies of Jehovah, others deplore the distressed condition of his peculiar people; indeed the whole history of the Jews, up to the time of the composition of the psalms, is made subservient to the purposes of praise. But not only are all the

leading features of the history of the Israelites thus introduced, but likewise prophetic declarations upon the subject of judgment to come. Thus in the xcvith Psalm :

“Let the sea be joyful, and all that is therein, then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord ; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth ; he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth.”

A similar passage occurs at the end of Psalm xcvith. one of the psalms appointed to be sung in the daily service of our church throughout the year. In the Te Deum we sing to the same effect, “We believe that thou shalt come to be our *Judge*.”

The terrible judgment of God upon Pharaoh and his host, constituted the subject of the first oratorio which the world ever heard. Upon that occasion Miriam the prophetess sang the principal treble, and Moses, the servant of the Lord, the leading tenor. This oratorio might properly be designated, “The overthrow of the Egyptians ;” and what was the burden of the song ? “I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously ; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.” Now, I ask the Editor of the RECORD, whether he thinks that “Moses and the children of Israel sang this song *unto the Lord*” for their *amusement* ? and whether we have not fully as much cause to “rejoice and give thanks” as they had ? The number of performers on that occasion was somewhat more than half a million ; so that we may safely imagine that the music was not of a very intricate character. The most majestic musical

effect has ever been found to result from the combination of power and simplicity. The next musical performance on record is, the duet of Deborah and Barak, in commemoration of the overthrow of the host of the Canaanites, and the destruction of Sisera their leader. This composition includes, not only a particular detail of the exploit of Jael, Heber's wife, but contains also a bitter imprecation against Meroz and its inhabitants, "because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty." Curses, however, are by no means of common occurrence in modern oratorios.

Turn we now to higher themes.

The Christian dispensation was ushered in with the singing of "a multitude of the heavenly host;" and their stupendous chorus was, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will towards men."

What was the particular subject of the "hymn" which was sung by our blessed Lord and his disciples just before his last sufferings and cruel death, cannot be precisely known, but doubtless its import did not essentially vary from that of the angelic *introitus*.

The sufferings of our crucified Lord and Saviour constitute one of the subjects of the exulting strains of his beatified followers: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain" is surely a sentiment which may well excite the grateful hearts, and employ the harmonious voices of his chosen people. They are said to sing "the song of Moses" also, and may *we* not sing it likewise? One of their songs, it is true, we cannot

learn until we join their blissful choir, because it is not yet revealed to us; but enough is revealed to us to satisfy the mind of the most scrupulous, that *all* the dealings of God towards his church may not only lawfully but laudably be made the themes of vocal praise. "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy; for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy *judgments* are made manifest." Herein the judgments of God are again introduced in sacred song, and subsequently we find the heavenly host engaged in commemorating in like manner the final destruction of "Babylon the great."

Having now shown what topics may properly be made the ground-work of sacred musical composition, I will, before I take my leave of this part of the subject, advert to the possibility of the introduction of other matters, which, although the word "sacred" may be prefixed in the title page, may yet be highly improper as sung in a *church*. Of this nature is a considerable portion of Haydn's otherwise every way admirable "*Creation*." The nature of the objection will be sufficiently obvious, without my entering farther into it. It were well if some of our ecclesiastical authorities would undertake the supervision of the words of all church performances, in order that nothing might be sung which could by the most scrupulous be considered really unfitting to be spoken in the "house of prayer;" and this makes it the more

to be regretted that the Bishop of London has thought proper totally to disconnect himself from the approaching festival at the Abbey. Musicians cannot be expected to be very sound theologians, and their love of their art may be supposed now and then at least to lead them to choose a composition without much—if indeed *any*—reference to the words, provided only the piece be denominated *sacred*. Of this a singular instance may be adduced. A clever writer in the *Spectator*, evidently a musician, in an article printed two or three weeks ago, gravely suggested to the managers of the approaching festival his wish that Mozart's celebrated "*Missa pro defunctis*" might be heard in Westminster Abbey! The editor of the *STANDARD* did not fail to take advantage from this circumstance to allege that the *words* are not taken into account by musical people, but that the pleasure they experience is solely derived from the music. But how knew he but that the writer in the *Spectator* might be a devout Roman Catholic, by whom the expression of such a wish would be by no means improper? The exquisite music of the *Requiem* may well occasion in the mind of every lover of art, and science, and taste, and genius, unfeigned regret that it has not yet been adequately adapted to other words which might be consistently heard in a Protestant church; but the proposal to perform it as it is, methinks savours very little of that spirit which led Robert Testwood (one of the choir of Windsor) to the stake, from which, after condemnation, his colleague

Marbeck, with great difficulty escaped.⁵ Some there are, who rather uncharitably deem that it would be difficult to find musicians of this age, who would suffer martyrdom rather than renounce their religious principles, and such suggestions as that of the *Spectator* are calculated to give a colour to the doubt. Painful, distressingly painful indeed it is to see men equally ready to take an engagement in either a Protestant church, a Popish chapel, or a Theatre; equally ready to serve God or *Baal*, and to prostitute their talents for any purpose so that they be but duly *paid*. But, as I have intimated before, it is not my part to expose abuses. I will only deplore them; and pass on.

The next point of attack, on the part of the op-pugners of music-meetings, more especially on that of the *RECORD*, is what I have termed "the alleged *adjuncts*," or accessories, which are stated to be "revelling and banquetting," "masquerading," "dancing," and "dissipation;" a formidable catalogue, to which I wonder that "chambering and wantonness," "battle and murder, and sudden death" were not added. Of this part of the story I shall make short work; for Mr. Editor has as egregiously erred, as he would have done in charging the judges of the land with all the frivolities practised in a county town, on the occasion of holding the assizes. I have attended

⁵ True, the prayers for the dead might be avoided by substituting "*nobis*" for "*eis*," wherever the latter occurs in the words of this justly-celebrated composition; but this would not remove the objection to singing in a language not "understanded of *all* the hearers."

several music-meetings, (principally those held in the West of England,) and have never been present at any revelling, banquetting, masquerading, or dancing : what to say to dissipation, I know not, until I can ascertain the meaning attached to the word by the propounder of the charge. He, perhaps, is not of the poet's mind, that "*dulce est desipere in loco*," still he should remember that all are not constituted upon the same model. Some, from the greater severity and intensity of their serious occupations, or, —it may be— from the greater weakness of their physical frame, require much more recruiting than others; and this very process may (for aught I know) be what he intends by the words, "revelling and banquetting." Certain it is, that music does in a remarkable manner excite the digestive organs; and equally certain (were it not so) that musical persons—whether performers or auditors—must have their daily food—or *die*. Now, when a great number of persons from neighbouring towns and villages are brought together in one place, for two or three consecutive days, it is not to be wondered at that some means are resorted to, either by themselves or by others, for *feeding* them. The Editor of the Record has perhaps forgotten the injunction, (of higher authority than that of Queen Elizabeth,) "*Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn.*" If he were to put himself in vocal training, at the rate of only six hours a day, he would soon be convinced that a singer needs a little more sustenance, than that which the "*east wind*," spoken of by Job's friend

Eliphaz, could afford him. Perhaps, however, the writer does not refer to such simple matters, when he speaks of "revelling and banquetting; and indeed, as he forthwith proceeds to enumerate "masquerading and dancing," as among the accessories of musical festivals, I think I can perceive what it is he is driving at; and I tell him at once, that such doings (be they *per se* laudable or otherwise) have no necessary or *natural* connexion with the performance of sacred music, and that it has long been the wish of the reflecting portion of the musical body, that as far as they are associated with such festivals *they should be put an end to*. They are attended merely by a few of the thoughtless, the giddy, and the gay; and thus those who really go to reap a rich devotional enjoyment, find themselves at unawares involved in a charge of *dissipation*. These things ought not so to be. Surely it is possible to conduct a music-meeting upon Christian principles. But what shall we say to the manner in which the performances are sometimes announced by printed placards and advertisements? In these may be seen the sacred name of the "Messiah," set forth in conspicuous characters in one part of the broadside, and perhaps in another a "Grand Fancy Ball," emblazoned in a type of equal magnitude; here announced, a sermon by some right Rev. Bishop, and there in ridiculously exaggerated letters, the name of some "star" from the Opera-house. Such combinations have not in them the nature of harmony: I will not attempt to defend them. Would to God they had never existed.

We come now to the consideration of what—in default of a better term—I have denominated the *actuating principles* or motives of the assembly, employing this last term in its widest sense, so as to include the performers as well as the auditors. And first for the auditors, whom the Editor of the RECORD styles “votaries of pleasure,” by which I suppose he would intimate that they are, in scriptural phrase, “lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.” I will not dare to take upon myself the functions of a judge in such a matter, and can by no means approve the spirit of infallibility and consequent dogmatic decision adopted by the writer of the article in question, which could be justified only upon the supposition of his having obtained from the high chancery of heaven a patent, as a “searcher of hearts.” Upon the subject of the nature of the pleasure which may be derived from such performances as those which have been particularly assailed, much has been already spoken, under a former head; I will not add to it now, further than to make a short extract from a writer, whose opinions the Editor of the RECORD himself will respect. The late Rev. John Newton, in the first of his discourses before alluded to, says,

“If it could reasonably be hoped that the performers and the company assembled to hear the music, or even the greater part, or even a very considerable part of them, were capable of entering into the spirit of the subject; I will readily allow that the *Messiah*, executed in so masterly a manner, by persons whose hearts, as well as their voices and instruments, were tuned to the Redeemer’s praise; accompanied with the grateful emotions of an audience duly affected with a sense of their obligations to his love; might afford one of the highest and noblest gratifications of which we are capable in the present life.”⁶

⁶ Messiah. Fifty Expository Discourses, London, 1786.

And now I will suppose it to be the fact, that some, perhaps even many, of those who attend sacred musical festivals, go thither from what I will term unworthy motives, desire for amusement, the vacuity of idleness, the fashion of the day, or (as the least exceptionable) a love of art. What then?—Shall the festivals themselves be therefore interdicted? By no means. Such a rule of action, once allowed, farewell to all the ordinances of religion itself. The adversaries seem to lose sight of the consideration, that if that class of society, which is so averse to all serious contemplation as rarely or never to engage in any religious exercises, are, by the attraction of music, brought into the house of God, they then are *brought to hear through that powerful medium the most solemn truths of revelation plainly and emphatically propounded*; and who shall say that this is an evil? The Editor of the RECORD may think that the sentiments musically uttered are totally disregarded; but if so, he knows little of the common operation of choral music upon the human system. In silence and in solitude, some scraps will continually recur, and as it were ring in the ears of those who have long since left the scene of performance; and *the words* will present themselves with the music. The association, once formed, is indissoluble. Who that hears simply the instrumental part of the Hallelujah Chorus, in the Messiah, but instantly feels his heart occupied with the words with which it has been so nobly associated, “Hallelujah! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!”

But there is another portion of the assembly—the

performers—upon whose actuating principles or motives in attending musical festivals, some few paragraphs must be bestowed.

Now of these it may fairly be assumed, that not a few are gathered together as a mere matter of business, or call it *duty*, to earn a given sum of money towards the maintenance of themselves and families. And, if the act in which they engage be not in itself unlawful, it will be difficult indeed to demonstrate that in so doing they are guilty of any impropriety: as says the apostle, “Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple?” Now doubtless, the sacred musician does “minister about holy things.” But this does not justify the inordinate desire of emolument which has unfortunately and disgracefully attached to the characters of some eminent performers; an evil which would be most effectually checked by the laying down a rule *never to publish the names of any of them*. I have heard indeed of low squabbles as to the order of precedence of the names, and even about the size of the letters in which they should be announced; degrading disputes, to which, with many other evils, such a measure as I have proposed would at once and for ever put an end. Neither would the interest of the performance be materially lessened by such an arrangement, it being sufficiently evident that the *choruses* and orchestral strength constitute the principal attractions.

But the greatest evil of all remains behind. It is asserted by the opponents of musical festivals, that the

moral and religious character of the performers is not such as to justify their being employed in the church. This is but obscurely hinted on the present occasion by either the STANDARD or the RECORD, but it is universally understood to be a standing objection on the part of those who religiously set their faces against such celebrations. It is therefore the more necessary to enter into the subject fairly and without reserve.

It is argued in conversation (for the subject is rather too personal in its tendency for public discussion) that men who feel nothing of the power of religion in their own hearts are of all others the least likely to impress it upon the minds of others, upon the principle laid down by the classical poet;

————— Si vis me flere, dolendum est
Primum ipsi tibi :

and it is uncharitably and unwarrantably assumed that musicians *generally* are men of this vile species; men who would sing with equal glee, the praises of Jehovah [it is almost an act of profanity to introduce the *name* in such a connexion] or those of Bacchus or of Venus; men in fact of any religion, or of no religion at all; men of dissolute and abandoned character, “the filth of the world and the offscouring of all things;” and I am sorry to be obliged to acknowledge, that I fear there *have* been some, whose conduct would fully justify the description. The impression indeed is so universal that I may safely ask—who is the man, moving in a reputable walk

in life, would—in choosing a profession or calling for his son—select that of a musician? Strange state of things to come to pass when larger portions of time and greater sums of money are probably devoted to the cultivation of (so-called) music, than were ever so appropriated in any former period of our history! Comparatively but a few years ago, great expectations were entertained from the institution of the Royal Academy of Music, expectations formed but to be disappointed, inasmuch as the academy, although sacred music has not been excluded, has, for the greater part, proved little better than a school for the opera. Indeed I much question whether this were not the primary intention of its founders. This is to be regretted; not merely upon religious grounds, but as being intimately connected with the interests of the science; for it is matter of history that if the English, as a nation, excel in any department of the art, it is in that of *church* music. But the existence of a Royal Academy, having such a bias as that just referred to, is not enough to satisfy some of the present race of musicians; as is apparent from the circumstance of a petition to the King for the establishment of an *exclusively English opera* being now in course of circulation for signatures; as though the metropolis did not already contain more than theatres enough. However, the grounds upon which the petition is founded, are indubitably true; and although I cannot coalesce with the prayer of the petition itself, for the establishment of a “*National Opera*,” I most cordially agree

with the sentiment expressed in the circular letter which accompanies it.

"If England is not regarded as a Musical nation, the cause must be sought in the *discouragement* of native Musical talent, originating, not so much in the distaste of the public for English Music, as in the want of an Institution wherein the English composer may find that reward for his labours, which shall enable him to prove that the fellow-countryman of a Newton, a Byron, a Shakespeare, and a Milton, can in his art, as they have so triumphantly done in theirs, if not surpass, at least equal his foreign competitors."

Of the fact here stated I entertain no doubt; although I much question whether the establishment of a "National Opera" be the best mode of fostering native musical talent, and therefore I cannot attach my humble signature to the petition.⁷ 'Tis true I am not the best qualified in the world to pronounce an opinion upon such a matter, never having been present at any kind of theatrical performance, (maugre the declaration of the RECORD, as to *church* performances,) and therefore necessarily forming but a very inadequate idea of its nature. It is not for me however to condemn an exclusively theatrical performer. "To his own master he standeth or falleth." I will not cast the first stone; only, I beseech the stoners, that I be not pelted in his stead.

This, however, is wide of the objection. If musicians be, as has been uncharitably alleged, commonly, or even in any considerable proportion to their actual

⁷ A clerical friend suggests the establishment of an *Oratorio* School. Such an institution, if it did no more than offer rewards for compositions, and afterwards perform and publish at its own expense the successful pieces, would do much to retrieve the character of English music. At present "an ascendant name is your only Mæcenas, and were an unknown Händel now to hawk his *Messiah* round the trade, he had better take it to the butter shop at once."—Quarterly Musical Review, vol. vii. p. 469.

numbers, men of dissolute and abandoned character,—a monstrously illiberal supposition,—how can the employment of their services in a church be defended? Now if, upon even such an absurdly improbable assumption as this, their services *can* be defended, assuredly there will remain little more to be said in vindication of musical festivals. In reply to the objection, if urged by a member of the Church of England, I would refer to the doctrine propounded in the *twenty-sixth article*, the title of which (as he may read in his prayer book) runs thus, “Of the unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the Effect of the Sacraments.” Now far be it from me to advocate the *intentional* employment of either unworthy ministers, or unworthy musicians; but surely I may infer from that article, that if the unworthiness of the minister hinder not the effect of the sacraments themselves, neither does the wickedness of the musician hinder the effect of the music. The article concludes thus :

“Nevertheless it appertaineth to the Discipline of the Church, that enquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences ; and finally, being found guilty, by just judgement be deposed.”

And so say I that it in like manner appertaineth to the discipline of the sacred orchestra, that inquiry be made of evil musicians. Not that I would have the managers of a festival to erect themselves into a corporation of spiritual inquisitors, but merely that they should lay it down as a rule, carefully to avoid the employment of any one of notoriously profligate

or irreligious character.⁸ The hint will be understood without my entering further into the invidious subject. If we are not lawfully to listen to sacred music until we can collect "a muster of singers and fiddlers" who shall at the same time be an array of *bonâ fide saints*, farewell to the celebration of the *praises* of God on this side of the grave.

But some may possibly object to the doctrine of the twenty-sixth article above quoted, notwithstanding that it may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture. I refer them to their Bibles, and bid them reflect upon this text, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" I will not enlarge.

However by no means, consistently with any approach to truth, can it be affirmed that musicians universally are men of no religion. I would fain hope indeed that their character in this respect has been steadily improving, from the days of Händel to the present time. Many I know, both in the Church of England and among that exemplary Christian people the Moravians, who cheerfully consecrate their musical talents to the service of their Creator; men

⁸ Methinks this would be a much more rational resolution than one which is said to have been arrived at by the committee of management of the coming Royal Festival, viz. that the works of *all living composers* shall be excluded. Why did they not, for consistency sake, follow this up by another, to the effect that they would hold the festival without availing themselves of the skill of any *living performer*!

Certain it is that for an English ecclesiastical composer, there is no passport to fame like the *death* of the claimant. Living, he may starve; dead, his name may be enrolled with the Purcells, the Crofts, the Boyces, and a host of other defunct worthies. Such is English patronage of English art.

whose highest delight it is to celebrate the praises of their Almighty Master; men who despise the frivolities and fooleries of the world around them, and who—under the influence of grateful piety,—resolve, with holy David, that if they play at all, they “will play before the Lord.” Would the Editor of the RECORD wish to drive such men from the church to the opera-house? He will not succeed in the attempt.

I have reserved till the last, the consideration of the objection which gave rise to the whole controversy,—the *place* in which the celebration is holden—viz. a *church*. And after what has been urged upon the preceding topics, little need to be advanced in demonstration of the propriety of holding a *sacred* festival in such an edifice. It would seem almost an easier task to prove the *impropriety of holding it in any other*. Where indeed can—what even the RECORD allows to be the subject matter—“the high praises of Jehovah,” so appropriately be sung as in His holy temple? Where can “the sacred mysteries of revelation” so fittingly be made the theme of a solemn religious exercise, as in a building consecrated to the service of the one—living—and true God? Where can His creatures so becomingly assemble to hear rehearsed in animating and soul-stirring strains, the wonderful works of the King of kings and Lord of lords; as in that house which is so peculiarly devoted to the extension of His kingdom upon earth?

“Oh that men would praise the Lord for his goodness; and for his wonderful works to the children of men!”

“Let them exalt him also *in the congregation of the people*; and praise him *in the assembly of the elders*,”
aye, even if it be in Westminster Abbey.

The objection to the place is in truth so ridiculously futile, that I feel it would be but a foolish waste of intellect to attempt to give it a serious refutation. Desecration? [for that is the word,] then desecration has become a Christian virtue. Desecration? then is heaven itself *desecrated*. Let such carpers consider what they say. We, at least we of the Protestant communion, are taught that after death there are but two states of being. In one of them there is sacred *music*, in the other *there is none*. Let them choose. In one, the musical festival is *eternal*; *the other place* is not so *desecrated*!

CLOISTERS, Bristol, May, 1834.

THE END.





